

ADDENDUM No. 1

RFP No. 25-20

Short-Term Rental Management and Compliance Software

Due: April 30, 2025 at 2:00 P.M. (local time)

The information contained herein shall take precedence over the original documents and all previous addenda (if any) and is appended thereto. **This Addendum includes five (5) pages.**

The Proposer is to acknowledge receipt of this Addendum No. 1, including all attachments in its Proposal by so indicating in the proposal that the addendum has been received. Proposals submitted without acknowledgement of receipt of this addendum may be considered non-conforming.

The following forms provided within the RFP Document should be included in submitted proposal:

- **Attachment B – City of Ann Arbor Non-Discrimination Declaration of Compliance**
- **Attachment C - City of Ann Arbor Living Wage Declaration of Compliance**
- **Attachment D - Vendor Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form of the RFP Document**

Proposals that fail to provide these completed forms listed above upon proposal opening may be rejected as non-responsive and may not be considered for award.

I. CORRECTIONS/ADDITIONS/DELETIONS

Changes to the RFP documents which are outlined below are referenced to a page or Section in which they appear conspicuously. Offerors are to take note in its review of the documents and include these changes as they may affect work or details in other areas not specifically referenced here.

Section/Page(s)	Change
Page 8	<p>Remove: "Integrate with Ann Arbor's licensing system, ownership database, and Geospatial Information System to cross-reference property compliance status."</p> <p>Replace with: "Integrate with Ann Arbor's licensing system (Tyler Technologies' EPL Energov Permitting and Licensing), ownership database (BS&A), and Geospatial Information System (ESRI) to cross-reference property compliance status."</p>

II. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

The following Questions have been received by the City. Responses are being provided in accordance with the terms of the RFP. Respondents are directed to take note in its review of the documents of the following questions and City responses as they affect work or details in other areas not specifically referenced here.

- Question 1: How do you discover that a vendor is using either foreign contract labor or “gig” economy workers such as Amazon Turkers for address identification or other administrative functions (which is very common throughout the str compliance industry)? If you find that a vendor is using these types of contractors, what is the qualifying “living wage”?
- Answer 1: The City’s Living Wage Ordinance applies to any employee of a company contracted with the City to provide services to the City no matter where the company or employees may be located geographically. Issues around the lack of Living Wages being paid to those who provide services to the City are primarily complaint driven but interested parties should be aware that if an employer is found to be in violation of the Ordinance it may be subject to civil penalties and termination of the awarded contract. More details around Living Wage along with the currently enforced Living Wage values can be found in Attachment C and Attachment F as provided in the RFP Document.
- Question 2: What licensing system is the City currently using that would require integration?
- Answer 2: Energov Permitting and Licensing (EPL) system which is owned by Tyler Technologies
- Question 3: for Section 3.1 - "reliably and accurately identify" - is there a service level agreement the City is expecting?
- Answer 3: An SLA is not necessarily required but we need to understand your capabilities and timelines for identifying short term rental properties.
- Question 4: for Section 3. how many existing active permitted STRs are operating in the City today?
- Answer 4: As of April 10, 2025, the City of Ann Arbor has 204 issued STR properties, 40 expired needing renewal, and 119 in various states of non-compliant. We do not know how many additional properties are operating without a license which is why we would like this software service.
- Question 5: for Section 3.15 - regular scheduled account check-in meetings - what frequency of check-ins does the City anticipate are required?
- Answer 5: During implementation and training, we anticipate more frequent check-ins (weekly or every other week). Once implementation is complete, we would like account check-ins on a monthly basis, which can be reduced to quarterly after our first year live. We are open to other approaches as well.
- Question 6: What is meant by "integration" with the registration system? Do you simply want an api interface between the two systems that will allow the third party system to query against the STR system to gather what ever information is pertinent to str's that the registration system might need for various reasons, in which case the STR system would handle the full registration process? Or will the existing registration system handle the entire registration process, in which case the STR system will have to interface to the registration system in order to do compliance reporting and to fulfill various other tasks in the rfp? Is the City interested in utilizing the selected vendor's registration/licensing system, or do you intend to maintain your current system?

- Answer 6: We will continue using our existing registration system, Energov Permitting and Licensing (EPL), to register/review/issue STR licenses. The STR system would be used to identify non-compliant properties, notify them, and direct them to register via the registration system. Once they are registered, we would like the STR system to update to reflect that the property is now compliant. For the integration, this could be an API pull from the EPL system to the STR system or a frequent automatic export/import between the two systems.
- Question 7: Where will non-compliance cases for short-term rentals be managed (existing software, part of the new software provided through RFP, manually, etc.)?
- Answer 7: Non-Compliance cases will be identified and managed in the new STR application until they register using our licensing software.
- Question 8: Is Ann Arbor's ownership database contained within the existing licensing system or are these two different databases being referenced in the RFP where there are integration needs?
- Answer 8: Ann Arbor's ownership data is housed in BS&A at <https://bsaonline.com/?uid=283>. The license holder recorded in our licensing application matches the BS&A data.
- Question 9: Is your existing licensing system organizing records by an individual/person or by a business?
- Answer 9: Both, the license holder can either be an individual or a company.
- Question 10: Is the intention with this RFP to keep processes in the existing licensing system the same or is redesigned your existing licensing system something that will be implemented at the same time as the work done through this RFP?
- Answer 10: The licensing system is already implemented and will remain the same throughout this process. (See Answer 6 for more details).
- Question 11: The RFP mandates that the software provide addresses and parcel numbers of rental properties. Given that platforms like Airbnb and Vrbo often do not disclose exact addresses, would the city accept approximate geolocation data (e.g., latitude and longitude) supplemented with confidence scores? Alternatively, is there an expectation for the software to derive exact addresses through other means?
- Answer 11: There is an expectation that the STR software purchased will derive the address/parcel of the listing.
- Question 12: Could you provide details on the city's current licensing system, ownership database, and GIS platform? Specifically, what are the data formats, access protocols (e.g., APIs), and any existing documentation that would facilitate integration?
- Answer 12: The current licensing system is Energov Permitting and Licensing (EPL) by Tyler Technologies. The ownership database is BS&A. The GIS platform is ESRI. All of our data resides in self hosted SQL databases. Further discussions regarding integration capabilities can be discussed during demos.
- Question 13: To ensure accurate data mapping and system compatibility, could the city provide sample records or data format specifications from the existing compliance and licensing databases? This would aid in tailoring the software to meet the city's specific data structure and requirements.
- Answer 13: See Answer 12.
- Question 14: The RFP mentions sending notifications to non-compliant short-term rentals. Does the city have a preference for digital notifications (e.g., email, SMS) over physical

- mailings? Are there existing templates or branding guidelines that the software should adhere to when generating these communications?
- Answer 14: We would like to utilize all contact methods possible, and would like to collaborate on the design to use City of Ann Arbor branding.
- Question 15: Is there an existing enforcement or case management system that the software needs to integrate with to track compliance status and enforcement actions? If so, could you provide details on its specifications and integration capabilities?
- Answer 15: See Answers 6 and 12.
- Question 16: The RFP specifies the need for integration with the city's business intelligence platform. Could you specify which BI tools are currently in use (e.g., Tableau, Power BI) and any preferred data formats or APIs for seamless integration? What business intelligence system is the City currently using that would require an API or data pull?
- Answer 16: We use Superset. We are flexible in how we get the data out of the STR system but would like it to be an automated process.
- Question 17: Regarding the public transparency dashboard, what specific data points does the city intend to display publicly? Are there any privacy concerns or regulations that need to be considered when presenting this data?
- Answer 17: This is TBD after we investigate product offerings. See Answer 16.
- Question 18: What is the expected level of training and support for city staff? Does the city prefer in-person training sessions, virtual workshops, or self-paced learning materials?
- Answer 18: We require hands on learning either in-person or virtual.
- Question 19: Post-implementation, what are the city's expectations regarding ongoing support, software updates, and system maintenance? Is there a preferred response time for support queries or system issues?
- Answer 19: We expect critical issues to be communicated and resolved as soon as possible. Non-critical issues we would expect replies within roughly 1 business day. We require security issues to be patched as soon as possible. Regarding software updates and maintenance, we expect ample communication in advance of any downtime as well as clear documentation regarding what changes to expect.
- Question 20: Are there specific data privacy regulations or policies that the software must comply with, especially concerning the collection and storage of property and owner information?
- Answer 20: The selected system must be secure but there are no particular regulations or policies. Specifically, contact information such as email address or phone number (if used for email or SMS notifications) should be protected.
- Question 21: In cases of non-compliance, what legal mechanisms does the city employ? Should the software facilitate the generation of legal documents or support workflows for legal proceedings?
- Answer 21: No we do not need legal documents or workflows.
- Question 22: What is the city's required duration for retaining short-term rental (STR) data, including property listings, owner information, compliance records, and communication logs?
- Answer 22: Indefinitely; we will need to continue to track and see history on a property until it reaches compliance.

- Question 23: Does the city require the ability to export all stored data in a specific format (e.g., CSV, JSON) for archival or analysis purposes?
- Answer 23: Yes, CSV at a minimum, additional formats would be appreciated.
- Question 24: Are there specific protocols or timelines for the deletion of outdated or irrelevant data to comply with privacy regulations or internal policies?
- Answer 24: See Answer 22.
- Question 25: Are there particular local, state, or federal data protection laws that the city's STR data management must adhere to?
- Answer 25: See Answer 20.
- Question 26: Does the city mandate detailed logging of data access and modifications for auditing purposes? If so, what are the specifications for these logs?
- Answer 26: Yes we would like a history log of activity within the system. No specific requirements for the format of these logs.
- Question 27: What are the city's expectations regarding data backup frequency, storage, and disaster recovery protocols to ensure data integrity and availability?
- Answer 27: We are open to seeing what each vendor recommends.
- Question 28: Are there any restrictions or guidelines on sharing STR data with third-party entities, including other government departments or external vendors?
- Answer 28: Personal identifiable information stored in the system should not be shared.
- Question 29: Does the city require the system to capture and store historical data on STR listings, including changes over time?
- Answer 29: Yes, we need to retain a history of past and present postings on an address.
- Question 30: Should the system track the duration of each STR listing's activity, including start and end dates, to monitor compliance over time?
- Answer 30: Yes.
- Question 31: Are there specific retention periods for historical listing data, and how should the system handle archiving or purging of outdated information?
- Answer 31: We would prefer to keep historic data but are open to discussion/recommendations from the vendor.
- Question 32: The RFP mentions public transparency, would the City be interested in a public-facing portal as an optional feature?
- Answer 32: This is not a necessary feature as we already have in-house tools to accomplish this.

Offerors are responsible for any conclusions that they may draw from the information contained in the Addendum.